DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 068 060 HE 003 510

TITLE	The Church and Society. Shaping Public Policy in Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	California Campus Ministry, Los Angeles. Committee on Higher Education and Public Policy.
PUB DATE	1 Sep 72
NOTE	30p.; A Report of Work in Progress by the Committee on Higher Education and Public Policy, California Campus Ministry Staffs
AVAILABLE FROM	The Bookstore, 1501 Wilshire, Los Angeles, California 90017 ($.75; $.50 for 10 or more)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Church Role; *Higher Education; *Public Education; Religion; *Religious Organizations; *Statewide Planning

ABSTRACT

The California Campus Ministry Staffs have joined other members of the Committee on Higher Education and Public Policy (COHEPP) in formulating testimony to be presented in January of 1973 to the California State Legislature by the Joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education. This document presents testimony on four crucial dimensions of the higher education situation. They are: values and governance, educational finance, educational planning and objectives, and alternative educational plans. Suggestions and proposals are presented for ways in which congregations of various churches might participate in forming the future of public higher education in California. (HS)

ED 068060

the Church and Society

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 003 510

SHAPING PUBLIC POLICY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

A Report of Work in Progress by the
Committee on Higher Education and Public Policy
California Campus Ministry Staffs
September 1, 1972

CONTENTS

1	The Church's Ministry in Public Education	page 1
2	Values and Governance	page 3
3	Financing Education	page 9
4	Planning and Goals	page 12
5	Alternative Education	page 14
6	Action Proposals	page 21
7	Resource Bank	page 22
Appendix I	Chronology of Events	page 25
Appendix II	Joint Committee Statement	page 27

this report is available from
THE BOOKSTORE AT 1501 WILSHIRE
LOS ANGELES, CA. 90017

Price: 75 ¢ per copy; 50 ¢ each in lots of ten or more

1

THE CHURCH'S MINISTRY IN PUBLIC EDUCATION

It has been said that the only subjects in Western culture worth studying are the history of the church, the history of the university, the history of the state, and the fate of the individual under all three. This report invites your participation in shaping events where those three major institutions of our society come together in public higher education.

In California the church, the university, and the state have a long history of interaction. (see appendix I) In the last eight years we have had a lot of public debate and not a little action. California higher education has been praised and vilified. It has been the locus of significant social experimentation, as well as the scene of considerable repression of social progress. It has met some of the challenges brilliantly; it has met others not at all. Whatever the history, 1973 is a year of decision for the fate of millions of individuals who will be touched by public higher education in the next eight years.

In January 1973 recommendations for the future of higher education in California will be presented to the legislature by the Joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education. At that time eight years rhetoric about educational reform, relevance of teaching, purpose of schooling, distribution of financing, participation in planning, and search for meaning will or will not be officially incorporated into the higher education master plan of this state. Assemblymen and senators will decide by their votes what the state policy is going to be.

The wider church, through the Committee on Higher Education and Public Policy (COHEPP) has made some contributions to the master plan study process. (see appendix II) Testimony on four crucial dimensions of the situation were offered in public hearings in Sacramento by COHEPP. The texts of that testimony are included as the four suceeding chapters of this report.

It is now up to congregations and church men and women individually to prepare themselves to participate in the kind of open public debate we anticipate in the Spring of 1973. Your assemblyman and senator will need to know where you stand on the questions of access, tuition, vouchers, goals, tenure, accountability, training, and governance. There is a large body of church tradition supporting free public education for a maximum number of the citizenry. We have supported education leading to personal growth and responsible citizenship. We have supported freedom of inquiry and freedom of speech. Public policy may reflect our concerns if our commitments are made known to the decision makers. The Carnegie Series makes the following comments on state officials and higher education:

> On the whole. . . . higher education has low political salience for state legislators because articulated demands from a broad section of the population are missing. As a result, policies and appropriations are less likely to be sacrificed in the kind of bargaining that occurs in policy areas where the stakes are seen as politically significant for survival. Therefore the legislator as an individual and the legislature as a whole can more readily play the role of 'trustee' in matters of higher education than might otherwise be possible. Lack of interest on the part of ordinary citizens, alumni, and special groups gives the legislature much freedom of action.

The legislature does have significant impact on higher education. What shape that impact will take depends partly on what is heard from articulate constituents. Some action suggestions are listed in chapter six of this report.

The church's ministry in higher education has taken, and still does take, many forms. The ministry ranges from teaching to pastoral care, from presence in the sacraments to counsel in high levels of administration. Our ministry with respect to the master plan is just one of the many facets of the work being done throughout the state. We hope that those pastors and laypersons who have particular interest in the

political arena will find this report helpful as a study and action guide for specific mission involvement during the coming year. This may mean setting up a special task force within the congregation or judicatory. It may mean adding special arms to COHEPP. Persons in congregations know that voluntaristic uses of energy are less and less feasible for many of the important vocations of mission. Yet very few congregations know how to change their basic style of organization to really get at an alternative style of work and living which can be responsive to society's deepest needs.

Some ministries within the church are attempting to find models for ministry which could be used in congregations committed to find a style of work which puts the many talents of heterogeneous communities to work. The church's ministries in higher education are attempting to find means of mission which are not on the fringe of events, but are aimed at the center of the power and suffering.

The recent, and on-going, experience of the COHEPP team may be of benefit to congregations looking for close-at-hand, purposeful mission involvement. The ministry of this team grew out of four roles which it and others had found over a series of years to be central to the church's mission. These four roles are:

PASTORAL: The church's care and counseling of persons
PRIESTLY: Worship, celebration and service to the people
PROPHETIC: Critical analysis and action in response to the current status quo
KINGLY: The administration of the strategy and program of mission and ministry

These roles formed the basic point of departure for a strategy of research-action which could raise questions about the needs of persons in California for a more adequate form of education. The strategy took the team into areas of governance, financing, planning and alternative kinds of education. Several points about the strategy should perhaps be made.

1. The team did not have vested interests in the current forms of higher education, but was involved deeply in the life of many different kinds of campuses.

2. The team put the emphasis upon issues in education, not structures or merely personal concerns of educators.

3. The team was highly mobile and able to be where decisions were to be made about the issues which had been chosen.

4. The team concentrated its efforts on specific policies, not general communication about the problems.

Congregations could do a similar kind of work either by finding one (or perhaps a few) basic issues upon which the entire body of persons would work. The goal is to effect change in the relationships between persons who make the decisions. Thus relationships become the object of the ministry, not persons (in the name of serving the whole person).

One task force (or ten) is not the panacea for the manysided problems faced by congregations today. However, "putting it together in the parish" is a must if the church is to be part of persons finding a person which gives inner meaning and regains control over the institutions which control them. You are invited to join with us, to use the COHEPP model of ministry in the public arena, to use the resources outlined in chapter seven, or to communicate with us directly.

The fate of the individual, indeed of all humanity, hangs somewhat in the balance these days. Active involvement by thoughtful, and faithful, persons in the affairs of the church and the university and the state may be the vital factor for a future worthy of our heritage.

2

VALUES AND GOVERNANCE

Your master planning task – and our testimony -- would be far easier were there unanimity about what constitute the "essential functions of higher education." You are as aware as we are that there are many angles of vision on what colleges and universities ought to do. Today we would like to underscore what we feel to be some critical areas where value judgements have strong implications for the governance of higher education.

Questions of value are extremely important to planning any social institution. There is no question about whether value judgements will be made. Value issues rather concern *what* is thought to be of value, *why* this choice is made, and in *whose* interests given values are chosen over others. This suggests that to ask questions about higher education as though one had only to deal with the proper "facts" is misleading and probably mischievous. Values do not exist in a vacuum but in very specific settings for particular reasons in the judgement of particular persons.

This seems to us to be highly relevant to the planning of higher education. For instance, many reasons are given for the maintenance or alteration of the present Master Plan. Consequently, we encourage the Committee to ask for unpacking of the value meanings of terms such as "excellence... service...prestige...intellectual...high quality...research...undergraduate education, and that most exclusive concept, the 'maintenance of standards'." For example, it may be quite one thing to value undergraduate education as a broad preparation for lifelong learning and intelligent citizenship and quite another to value it as specialized training in a particular discipline in preparation for graduate studies and careers as academic professionals. And it becomes yet another value issue when undergraduate education is advocated for instrumental reasons, i.e. in order to warrant the allocation of FTE's necessary to graduate education or a highly specialized major for a relatively few students. Value questions are paramount. In the words of Dr. Warren Bryan Martin of the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at U.C. Berkeley,

> "Nowhere do men teach just anything; everywhere they exercise selection, taking one thing, rejecting something else. And philosophical norms, consciously or unconsciously espoused, provide criteria for selection, continuation and change." 1

As another example, Dr. Martin points out that despite their differing ancestries institutions of higher education tend to what he terms "isomorphism," the condition of being – or striving to be -- identical in form or substance. He suggests that a consequence of this isomorphism is that,

> "...discrimination is rampant....not toward those of a different color or socioeconomic status but toward those whose qualities are not defined or validated by the conventional criteria of academic excellence." 2

One result of this heavy weighting on one model of what academic excellence implies is that instead of multiplicity and diversity of values in a time of rapid change we are faced with a comparatively limited range of educational options.

Testimony presented to the Joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education in California, February 23, 1972, on behalf of the Committee on Higher Education and Public Policy of California campus ministry staffs. The testimony was written and offered by William Van Ness, campus pastor at U.C. Santa Barbara for United Ministries in Higher Education, assisted by members of the HEPP committee.

In sum: like it or not, institutions of higher education are supporters of certain values. Where these are clearly understood and affirmed by a broad range of members of college and university communities they encourage evaluation, promote cooperation and permit mid-course changes with a minimum of disruption. Where values are vague, conflicting or uncommunicated they breed dissension, distrust, and governance by bureaucratic structures which discourage consensus and frustrate participation.

We would like to underscore for the Committee two areas which we feel to be notable value issues with which higher education ought to deal directly.

First, the issue of equal justice for all citizens. A major point of the recently published Carnegie Commission Report on Federal Aid to Education notes that "The highest single priority for higher education in the 1970's is to help fulfill the two-century old American dream of social justice." 3 There is far more agreement that this is a prime goal than on the means of seeing it become a reality. Yet, there is no choice but for higher education to overcome the results of past neglect.

It will be apparent that no single or simple model of education will do this. The needs of the wide range of educationally disadvantaged persons call for flexible planning and alternative forms of higher education that go beyond the traditional modes of middle-class certification. One of the gifts of racial minorities to the white middle-class is the insight that there is no one-to-one relationship to be found between the cultural values of the latter and "truth" or "how things *really* are."

At the minimum, this primary social value of equal justice suggests for higher education governance that those who have been educationally disadvantaged have access to positions on the governing boards of our systems and institutions. By "access" we mean participation in the governance processes as full members.

Further, the higher education of racial minorities and others who have had little part in colleges and universities to date, i.e. lower-middle-class whites, 4 will require new understandings of teaching and learning than are dominant in most American graduate schools at the present time. David Riesman of Harvard and his associates note that the attempt to import a traditional model of instruction into urban, commuter campuses has encountered considerable dissonance between the expectations of the faculty and those of students drawn in great numbers from lower income families. 5

Our second major issue in the growth of persons. American higher education has excelled in cultivating cognitive, highly verbal skills. Our universities and their graduate schools have achieved worldwide stature for the brilliance of their highly specialized scholarship. The University of California is an outstanding example of such a towering reputation.

However, growing numbers of the students who we contact are restive with what they consider to be only a partial education. They are deeply conscious of the discrepancy between the intellectual development which typical middle-class education has offered them and their own growing awareness that they are far more than disembodied minds. Consequently they ask in so many ways how they may become person-centered, more conscious of their own possibilities, more caring, more whole in their self-hood. We observe that colleges and universities have made little headway in answering these basic human needs for deepening understanding.

We also observe that there is little attention paid in higher education to the others who might be linked with students in academic communities: the faculty, the administrators and the staff. We believe that one of the most important functions of governance is to take into account what is happening in the lives of those who engage in higher education.

We we would submit that the issue of persons and their growth is an increasingly important one for those who govern. One of the most telling ways of discovering what is really goind on in an institution would likely be to ask questions such as the following:-

Why do students drop-out of X College?
What are the so-called "non-academic reasons" for dropping out?

Why do other students stay?
What is taking place in the lives of junior faculty at X?
What has X enhanced in the lives of tenured men and women?
What is happening in the lives of administrators as they discharge their responsibilities?

Of these questions, it may be that inquiries about faculty and administrators will tell the most about the institution.

(Parenthetically, we would add that -- quite frankly -- we are skeptical about the freedom of official spokesmen for the state's higher education segments to represent the range and variety of values and goals that are held by the persons in their systems. For this reason we believe it to be of great importance that the master planning process include direct input concerning goals and purposes from the faculty, administrators and students of the public and private colleges and universities.)

To raise the issue of the growth of persons is to be faced with the immense need for flexibility in higher education. It seems to us a foregone conclusion that education in the future will have to be a "life-long learning" rather than the present sixteen-year sequence of courses that culminates in acquisition of a B.A. degree. The "extended degree" programs of the California State Colleges and the University of California testify to their awareness of the growing demand for many educational options. Again, the emphasis will have to be on what persons need rather than on traditional structures or tracking. "Stopping-out" and re-entry will probably characterize the future of higher education. Certainly there will be less reliance on familiar educational "packages."

We would like to suggest some values which we believe deserve incorporation in whatever governance processes and structures serve California colleges and universities in the future.

First, governance should have an "open texture." Particularly, in campus governance it is desirable to provide for ease of communication, easy access to decision-makers and an air of trust that can only result from open leadership and planning. Peter Caws 6 offers two principles which we feel are compatible with this sort of governance:

1. The curriculum must be interesting, as judged by the students who are compelled to follow it. (By "interesting" we do not mean either "easy" or "shallow.")
2. The government must be fair, as judged by the faculty and students who are ruled by it. (By "fair" we do not mean either "soft" or "flimsy."

Second, rewards need to be shared. Morris Keeton, a nationally known leader in higher education planning, observes that only those campuses can become outstandingly efficient and effective in the performance of their chosen functions in higher education who achieve in their power-sharing strategies a measure of the positive-sum game -- in which everyone can gain something, and the non-game in which there is a great deal of sensitive listening and accomodation. 7 This stands in sharp contrast to what Columbia University's Earl McGrath calls,

> ". . . the pernicious conception that the academic society -- which in the best sense should be a community of learning -- must be composed of subgroups whose interests by the nature of things are competitive." 8

Third, higher education expertise should be rigorously employed. According to the Assembly on University Goals and Governance of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, it is rarely

the case that universities are involved in a subtle or complex analysis of education at any level. The Assembly suggests that,

> "It is unreasonable for the university to pride itself on its expertise in numerous other areas and be ready to accept its continued ignorance on many aspects of its own prime concern -- education." 9

There is a wealth of material concerning higher education and its governance being published every year. Some of the very finest is published as the results of research either done by or commissioned by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, a special research unit of U.C. Berkeley. The Center is a splendid resourse for the Master Plan Committee in its deliberations. We note with appreciation that Dr. Lyman Glenny of the Center has already taken part in Committee staff analysis of the Master Plan Study.

Were we engaged in the governance of higher education systems we would mandate the use of institutional research, done in a thorough and competent manner. Further, we would reward those campuses which made particularly adept use of self-study information in their campus educational planning.

Fourth, governance should be shared. We favor the sharing of governance among all of those who are affected by a given decision-making context. Particularly, we advocate the inclusion of students in campus governance, along with faculty and administrators. We believe that students should be expected to share with faculty the responsibility for ordering their own growth as learners. We believe that campus governance should be locally defined and suited to the unique context where it occurs.

Keeton 10 suggests four grounds for governance:-

1. Those whose lives are most affected by campus activities should have a hand in their control.
2. Those who are most competent to do the work of the campus should have a voice that ensures the most effective use of their competence.
3. Those whose cooperation is essential to the effectiveness of the campus in its work should have a place in governing that facilitates their continuing cooperation.
4. Those whose sponsorship and resources created and sustained the institution... are entitled to protect and further their purposes and interests.

Students and faculty can scarcely be expected to take a lively sense of responsibility for the welfare of a campus where they have no feeling of participation in its goal-setting or its long-term success. We regard the failure to include students in meaningful forms of campus governance as doubly unfortunate: they are given too few opportunities to share responsibility for planning a potentially significant part of their own lives; and they are effectively barred from a live experience of managing the tensions and ambiguities of a complex human community. T.R. McConnell, one of the elder statesmen of American higher education, writes that,

> "If students want to change educational policy, it seems apparent that they will have to win the right to participate in making academic decisions. They are well aware that a purely advisory and consultative role will give them little influence. I therefore agree with Lunsford and Duster (Encyclopedia of Education,

1970) that, "it will not be surprising if organized action for collective power *as students* on their campuses is a striking feature of American student life in the decades to come." 11

We believe that sharing in campus governance is an experience of learning that should be provided to students on a full and serious basis. There should be suitable rewards for this sort of service as a recognized and valued part of the academic experience. Where it is necessary to alter the rules of a higher education system to permit shared governance we believe that the regulations of an administration or academic senate ought appropriately to be changed to make it possible.

Finally, those who govern should represent both competence and diversity. Since the 1860's colleges and universities have been governed chiefly by laymen, i.e. non-faculty and non-clergy in contrast to an earlier practice. We are appreciative of the strengths that many lay trustees and regents have brought to their service on governing boards, and even more impressed by the significant service that they have performed after an initial period of orientation to higher education. However we suggest that success in corporate business, in industry or in professional life are not the chief criteria on which the selection of governing boards ought to be based.

It has been remarked that service on governing bodies must be sufficiently prestigious to attract able persons. The meaning of "able" at this point is entirely dependent on the values that are held to be of chief importance. If it is necessary for an educational segment to vie competitively for funds and political influence it is reasonable to suppose that persons with significant political contacts must be engaged in governance. However, if educational vision is highly valued as a qualification for governance it will require other sorts of competence. We favor a balance among those who govern; we believe that it should bring to governance several kinds of perspective and ability. Our ideal governing board would include:-

College and university faculty
Corporate, business and professional leaders
Experts in the field of higher education (these may or may not be college or university faculty)
Young people (the median age of Americans is now under 26)
Members of racial minority groups
A significant number of women

We believe that the selection of governing boards ought to follow from an analysis of their function based on a careful appraisal of the values that the educational unit in question holds to be vital.

We support the contention of U.C. Berkeley sociologist, Neil Smelser, that California higher education needs high-level educational planning and coordination over and above the present four segments. Like Professor Smelser, we do not favor a "superboard" or a system like the State University of New York. However, we believe it necessary that there be planning, coordination and allocation of resources by a board with power to plan, review, and allocate that will provide more effective guidance and use of resources than is now the case. It seems apparent that the present vocabulary, cooperative model of a Coordinating Council with virtually no power to act will not be adequate to prevent the maintenance of inter-segmental competition or political maneuvering for funds on the part of individual campuses.

We also support Professor Smelser in suggesting that a high-level governance board be removed as far as possible from partisan political manipulation. We grant that no public body nominated or appointed by political actives will be entirely free from the danger of partisanship overshadowing educational planning. Yet, we hope that the present public segement and any high-level agency that is created will be insulated from partisanship, by law, to the maximum possible degree.

It is our hope that master planning of higher education in California will be done carefully and thoroughly. We encourage persons engaged in the planning process to leave no assumptions unexamined. We believe that the deliberate selection of significant values and their aggresive enhancement in higher education planning is a persuasive and central concern.

However, if no specific goals and values are raised to consciousness and reflected in master planning, then we will have to agree with the previous testimony of the University of California and the California State Colleges that there is no point in tinkering with governance for its own sake.

If, in the course of the master planning process, values are carefully selected and implemented, we will share a service useful to ourselves and our fellow citizens. We are at the same time reminded that the needs of our state will continue to change, and that in a few years another committee will launch a study to your present one. Let us hope so. We hope that the goals which will guide your master planning will meet the needs of higher education for the next several years, and that the effectiveness of this plan will form the eventual creation of its successors.

We firmly believe that important changes are necessary in California higher education. We are testifying today because we are deeply concerned about its future. We seriously recognize the need for the deliberate directing of change, since it will occur whether we like it or not. We hope that the segments of California post-secondary education will join you in aggressively identifying where and why change is needed, and how it may be directed.

NOTES

1. Warren Martin. *Conformity: Standards and Change in Higher Education* (S.F.: Jossey-Bass, 1969) 217

2. Ibid., 189

3. "Federal Aid to Education," a report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education in *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* December 13, 1971.

4. K. Patricia Cross. "New Students of the '70s" in *The Research Reporter* of the U.C. Berkeley Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, (VI) 4, 1971, Iff

5. David Riesman, et al. *Academic Values and Mass Education* Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1970)

6. Peter Caws. "Design for a University" in *Daedalus,* Winter, 1970, 84ff

7. Morris Keeton. *Shared Authority on Campus* (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1971 124

8. Earl McGrath. *Should Students Share Power?* (N.Y.: Columbia Univ. Press 1969) 84

9. *"A First Report"* of The Assembly on University Goals and Governance of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, thesis 47, p.24

10. Keeton, op. cit., 9

11. T.R. McConnell. *The Redistribution of Power in Higher Education* (Berkeley: The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1971) 47

3

FINANCING EDUCATION

The task of financing post-secondary education is obviously a formidable undertaking. There is a growing awareness that education is a lifelong process which should be available to the total community rather than being the particular perogative of white, middle class, post adolescent youth. How to develop educational opportunities which meet a diversity of personal and societal needs with open access to the total community and yet at the same time develop some equitable means of financing such an educational system is a major challenge w ich will face this legislative session and probably many legislative sessions yet to come.

We would not presume to offer recommendations about detailed financing proposals. However, we would like to raise two issues for the Committee which we would hope would be kept in the forefront of any proposed changes in assessing fiscal responsibility for higher education. It was the intent of the original Master Plan in 1960 to guarantee access to high education for all California citizens. In retrospect, it appears that the Master Plan had the effect of decreasing, rather than increasing, access within the three components of the Master Plan itself. However laudable equality of access may have been as a dream or as a goal, we believe that it is time for post-secondary education either to fulfill its promise or else adjust its rhetoric to match its performance. Obviously whether or not one is able to afford a college education is still a major determinant as to whether one will be able to take advantage of existing educational opportunity.

Two students recently came to my office for marriage counseling. The young man remarked--hopefully somewhat facetiously--that before he asked his fiancee to marry him, he had to ask a prior question, "How much do you owe in NDEA loans?" The question regarding the extent of student responsibility for educational expenses is a legitimate one and should be explored openly and fully. However, to assume that students offer an untapped gold mine of financial resources to lift the financial burden from their elders' backs is misleading and naive.

A recent conversation with Mr. John Roberts, Director of Financial Aids at my own campus, San Francisco State, revealed an interesting fiscal profile of the contemporary state college student. 1

Twenty five per cent (25%) of the SF State student body is already receiving some form of "high need" student aid (i.e., NDEA loans, work study, EOP grants, etc.), and the percentage is growing every year. Another forty per cent (40%) of the student body have processed federally insured student loans through private banks and lending institutions. This means that, at the present time, sixty five per cent (65%) of the student body is already needing additional financial assistance, beyond their own and family resources, to help them complete their education. Forty per cent (40%) of the student body is actually incurring indebtedness in the process, and this percentage is also growing at a steady rate.

The average student in the latter category graduates with a debt totalling $2,400. Twenty per cent (20%) of the total loan borrowers will have a debt of $4,000 on NDEA alone.

The situation with a married couple is apt to be more critical. Ten per cent (10%) of the student loan borrowers--mostly married students--are having to borrow maximums available under both the NDEA program and the federally insured program (i.e., totalling $2,600 per year) to enable them to complete their educations. In the case of married couples, the total indebtedness cited above would have to be doubled in many cases. There is a growing indication that in many instances more and more women will have to work, even after having children, to help pay off this indebtedness. With massive indebtedness, this choice would be dictated by economic necessity rather than personal choice--this during a period when many women are most concerned about freedom from such economic necessity.

Testimony presented to the Joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan and Higher Education in California by Lorenz Schultz on behalf of the United Ministries Committee on Higher Education and Public Policy. April 19, 1972

We would not draw an exact parallel between the SF State figures and every other campus in the system, but we would suggest that they indicate a need for careful system wide study and research before further major shifts in fiscal responsibility occur. There is a growing tendency to send forth graduates from our educational institutions encumbered with indebtedness mounting into the thousands of dollars. Additional financial burdens await them as they establish their families, purchase homes, pay for medical care, and othersie cope with life in 20th century America. The Committee study questions under Financing (Question II-A,B,C) speak squarely to these implications, if additional fiscal responsibility were shifted to the students. We would hope that the Legislature would carefully evaluate the impact of such a shift upon students, their educational aspirations, their future fiscal solvency, and the educational process itself.

Whether or not the primary purpose of post-secondary education should be to equip one for gainful employment is debatable, and hopefully the question of purpose will be addressed elsewhere in the study process. However, it is becoming abundantly clear that a college degree does not guarantee gainful employment. The time honored purpose of post-secondary education as holding post-adolescent youth off the labor market until the labor market is able to absorb them is in and of itself beginning to collapse. In recent testimoney before the Select Committee on the Master Plan of CCHE 2, Dr. Clark Kerr reported that the Carnegie Commission found that by 1980, while 2/3's of the population will attend college and 1/2 will graduate, only 1/5 of the available jobs will require a college education--even though 1/3 of the population will be college trained. Many of my colleagues would join me in being able to tell of recent UC and state college graduates trained as teachers who may never be able to teach or social workers who may never be able to do social work. These tales of disappointement and frustration could be told many times over in many disciplines. One does not need to be a devotee of such social visionaries as Robert Theobold to be aware that vocational opportunities--at least in the sense of being able to provide a basic level of sustenance and comfort--are shrinking rather than expanding. To ask students to assume an ever greater share of the cost of their education in the face of growing economic and vocational uncertainty seems to be based upon questionable assumptions which deserve careful scrutiny.

A second and more specific concern focuses upon educational opportunity for the economically disadvantaged and members of ethnic minorities. Here again the promise of post secondary education in California has far exceeded its performance, and we would hope that the Committee would keep this failure in mind during its deliberations.

The staff report, Shut It Down: A College in Crisis, an analysis of the strike at San Francisco State College prepared for the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, made the following observation regarding the 1960 Master Plan and educational opportunity for minority students.

> "In one sense, San Francisco State is the victim of California's attempt to set up a three-track higher education system, where the best students go to the University of California, the next best to the State Colleges, with the junior colleges reserved for anyone else." 3

In the face of Master Plan rhetoric "guaranteeing access to higher education for all California residents," talk of one of the sustem's campuses being a "victim" of that intent may seem exaggerated, but I believe that careful analysis of actual performance in providing educational opportunity for disadvantaged students would support this analysis.

For example, it is reliably estimated that between 1960 and 1968, the percentage of the Black students enrolled at San Francisco State College declined from 10% of the total enrollment to 4% of the student body. 4 We would not suggest that this was an intentional aspect of the Master Plan design, but the effect of the Master Plan was to develop and rigidify a highly stratified, three track higher education system which further aggravated the historic exclusion of minority students from opportunity for post secondary education.

Through the Education Opportunity Program (EOP) and other programs to expand educational opportunity for disadvantaged students, educational opportunity began to expand and improve. And yet it is little wonder that disadvantaged students and their families have little confidence in the state's commitment to equal educational opportunity.

Here once again the EOP program is a case in point. In the three year period, 1969-72, during which the State College EOP enrollment went from 3,150 students to a projected total of 11,014 students in the fall of 1972, the total amount of money in the state budget for EOP grants has gone from a maximum of $1.9 million in 1970-71 to zero dollars in the proposed 1972-73 fiscal budget. 5 The EOP Director at San Francisco State estimates that this year alone some 200 students have been unable to participate in the SF State EOP program solely because of the pressures brought about by lack of financial support.

Once again it appears that just as the institutions of higher education in state of California are on the verge of guaranteeing access to post secondary education to all its citizens that we once again must begin adding the qualifying phrase, "All citizens who are financially able to afford higher education". We do not deny the very real fiscal crisis posed for higher education, but any solution whether on issues such as EOP or proposed revisions in the Master Plan, which opts for placing massive, crippling debt on the shoulders of our college students--particularly disadvantaged and minority students who have been historically excluded from the system--means that we will only be passing a burden to the next generation which we ourselves have neither the commitment or the dedication to selve. Such solutions can only deepen the growing divisions in our society and compromise the ideals and goals which higher education is supposed to serve.

Footnotes

1. Conversations with Mr. John Roberts, Director of Financial Aid, San Francisco State College, April 5 & 7, 1972.

2. Testimony by Dr. Clark Kerr to the Select Committee on the Master Plan, CCHE, February 15, 1972, p. 2.

3. Shut It Down: A College in Crisis, A Report to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, June, 1969, p. 75.

4. Ibid.,.

5. Legislative Analyst's Report to the Legislature on Proposed 1972-73 State Budget, p. 1103.

4

PLANNING AND GOALS

Today's hearing examines fundamental assumptions and societal goals in relation to short-range and long-range planning for post secondary education in the state. The problem as I see it is that planning as we have it now and have had it in the past has different presuppositions from planning as we should have it now and must have it in the future.

I will discuss the changes in fundamental assumptions and in societal goals which require changes in planning for education. I will then suggest some specific changes in the planning process.

Certainly the fast moving society in which we now live puts rigorous demands on the ingenuity and skill of planners. All the major institutions of our society are feeling the stresses of rapid social change. That includes educational institutions. John Gardner said several years ago,

> A first step toward a sound philosophy of institutional redesign would be to break our habit of concentration exclusively on the routine repair of institutions. 1

We need redesign of the planning process for education in the state. This is different from routine repair in between master plans. The Legislature should make substantive changes in the organization of education in the state. Such changes should be commensurate with the substantive changes in society which press in upon us more heavily day by day.

I would not deprecate the genius and hard work which have brought California education to the richly deserved pinnacle it has achieved. Nor would I suggest that present educational leadership wants anything but the best for the state and its citizens. On the other hand, the speed and complexity and intensity of life is increasing logarithmically; that is on an exponential curve. Unless the major institutions of our society re-tool to cope with that situation, the chances are slim for a stable and orderly transition to the new age.

The new age can be described by words like "cybernetic" and planetary." They take the place of old words like "industrial" and "nationalistic." Another way to describe the change would be talk of the change in societal goals from national and economic sovereignty (to be held at any cost among competing nations) to political and economic stability (achieved cooperatively and for mutual benefit.)

Three drastic changes in society which directly affect educational policy and planning in the state turn on the words cybernation, peace, and ecology.

Cybernation and advanced technology demand a more sophisticated citizenry. They also provide the means to achieve that sophistication. Political decisions are increasingly more complex and crucial. The general public (that is the electorate and taxpayers) are being called upon to decide matters of financial, scientific, sociological, legal, and ethical import which require sound judgement, factual information, and a broad range of knowledge and experience. 2 The provisions of the Clean Environment Act, to be voted on in June, presuppose those kinds of voters.

1 - John W. Gardner, address given as he accepted Cal Tech's first annual Robert A. Milliken Award at Los Angeles, as quoted in the Los Angeles Times, December 1, 1968.

2 - Chester M. Pierce, "The Pre-schooler and the Future," Futurist Magazine 2/ 72

Testimony offered by Albert G. Cohen Com. on Higher Ed. and Public Policy of California Campus Ministry staffs, April 5, 1972 - Sacramento.

In addition it has been suggested that 65% of the jobs which the present elementary school children will hold in their mature working years have not been invented yet. That is how fast the job market is changing. Some economists are projecting four major vocational changes as the norm during the working years of today's children. What kind of education will best equip today's youngsters for that kind of lifetime experience? Education which substitutes automobile overhaul and TV repair for world history and language skills is not the answer. Many of today's journeymen carpenters (whose return to the crafts has caught peoples' imagination) are also poets and artists. I believe the recent emphasis on vocational training is totally out of phase with the trends in society. 3 I would modify that statement if I thought it were intended that vocational training take place within the context of education in the humanities.

Peace among the nations is a second drastic change forced upon us by our shrinking planet. President Nixon's recent trip to China lends credibility to the suggestion that cooperation and accomodation mark the style of international relations of the future. There is a growing relization among all peoples that we are one planet with one future. Atomic anihilation of each other only means we all lose and nobody wins.

The involvement of California higher education in atomic weapons research and development 4 is counter-productive in terms of building a viable society for the future. No matter how much or how little of the budget of the University of California it underwrites, at best weapons production makes confidence in the educational process very difficult for bright and aware citizens of the state. 5 For us to get out of the weapons business would take significant fiscal planning, not just routine budget repair.

There are many specific ways in which higher education encourages society's goals for a peaceful and livable world. For example, international students and faculty contribute to a cosmopolitan milieu on the campuses. They are living witnesses to the small planet concept. Having a room-mate from Japan is a better educational experience than reading all the books on Japan in the library. Yet current policy is to decrease international presence. Cal Poly San Luis Obispo had 500 foreign students, now has 250, and is losing more next year. "Penny wise and pound foolish" may best describe the plan to save on the budget by eliminating foreign students. I believe it is in the self-interest of the United States and of California education to plan to increase the size of the international community on every campus in the state. We should provide subsidies so that those international visitors represent as broad as possible a spectrum of social and political backgrounds in the countries from which they come.

Another vital dimension of the academic community is provided by Black, Mexican-American and Oriental presence on each campus. Cal State Los Angeles is in the enviable position of enjoying a healthy cross section of the community among its students. The other campuses should at least be pluralistic to the extent of enrolling the California state distribution which (according to the 1970 census) is 7% Black, 9% Mexican-American, and 2% Oriental. That should be one of the goals for educational planning.

I am suggesting that a world without war depends upon men and women of various backgrounds meeting and understanding one another. Higher education plays a role in that process and should plan its role more intentionally.

3 - Dr. Sidney P. Marland, Jr, U.S. Commissioner of Education, vocational policy

4 - Stuart H. Loory, "Berkeley and the Bomb" West Magazine, Los Angeles Times, 3/1/70

5 - Dr. William McGill, Scranton Commission testimony, 8/4/70

Ecology represents the third drastic change. The word used to mean simply recycling bottles and cans. Now we understand the crisis in the environment to portend a drop in the gross national product of $6 billion per year between now and 1980. (according to the Environmental Protection Agency in Washington, D.C.) It appears that major shifts in our economic policies will be required to avert the collapse of what we have called the free market and the decline of our standard of living. 6 Educational planning for the next ten years must take very seriously the consequences of such dramatic changes in the economy. The poor and disinherited of our own state and country have been speaking in recent years. They perceive that the educational establishment is having great difficulty responding to these new clients who feel they have some special needs. How shall we continue present planning procedures which cannot deal adequately with the present spectrum of economic levels and expect to cope with the social and economic impact of the environment crisis in a creative way?

We have not begun to feel the pressure we shall feel from Latin America, Africa, and Asia as uncounted millions of our fellow human beings are stimulated to rising expectations for themselves by satellite television instant coverage around the globe. We believe that minor repairs are not going to equip institutions of the United States, including California Higher Education, to deal with that prospect.

The list of drastic changes could continue. The point is that things are changing. Healthy institutions will adapt. Unhealthy institutions will maintain old policies and practices, and will perish. It is that simple. 7

Willis B. Harmon mentions a number of educational trends which I commend to your attention in his paper, "The Nature of our Changing Society; Implications for Schools." 8 Among them are,

> the probability of (a higher percentage) of the populace being involved in education; a new conscious role for education to play in accomplishing social goals and alleviating perceived social problems; and extension of power and control of education to new groups including teachers, students, and minority groups. 9

John Gardner has called for a "sound philosophy of institutional redesign." As that relates to planning and goal setting, there are three specific suggestions for change I wish to make. They relate to the Joint Committee study plan as indicated below.

6 - Jay Forrester & Dennis Meadows, The Limits to Growth, Time Mag. 1/24/72
Johnson and Hardesty, Economic Growth vs the Environment, Wadsworth Press, 1971

7 - Riebold A. Humphrey, American Council on Education memorandum dated 11/23/70 summarizing the findings of the Eisenhower Commission, Linowitz Committee, and Scranton Commission . . . . "new flexibility and adaptability to the pressures for change are now institutional imperatives. All three (commissions) support the reform of campus governance . . ."

8 - Willis W. Harmon, "The Nature of our Changing Society; Implications for Schools, "contained in Metropolitan Planning Branch of the Diociese of California Information Paper No. 13, dated 1/28/70.

9 - Ibid. pp 54 ff.

First - refer to study plan p. 27 IB,IIB and V -- Who should do the planning? Planning should be done by those who receognize the changes in society and who understand what the new goals are.

My reading of the last severn year's struggle for education reform in this state is that it has been an adversay process, with a great deal of official planning either neutral or against change. What we have needed is advocacy planning. Planning committees and bodies (like the Coordinating Council) might have been more helpful had they included in their membership Negroes, Mexican-Americans, Orientals, women, students and others pursuing the new societal goals outlined in this paper. The University is in court right now because women's rights are alleged to have been violated. Far from planning for a university which recognizes women as full partners, court pressure has to be levied just to have the law obeyed. Harmon said education should be "alleviating perceived social problems," not causing them.

If an educational planning agency is going to do planning, or review planning, its membership must include Negroes, Mexican-Americans, Orientals, young people, women, futurologists, uncredentialed (as well as credentialed) people, planners (like people on the board of California Tomorrow) representatives of business and finance (who are doing the planning now) as well as experts from other states and even other countries. Thereought to be at least one ex-officio representative from another country and another continent, feeding into the planning process new and fresh ideas.

In as much as the trustees and regents are planners, these criteria apply to those boards as well.

Second - refer to study plan P. 27 IV - Educational planning should be the on-going and continuous responsibility of an educational planning agency set up on the model of the Office of the Legislative Analyst. Like Alan Post's office, it should be staffed by competent people who will make objective decisions. The staff should be non-partisan, not only in the political sense, but also in the sense of not being beholden to any of the four major segments of education. The office should have authority to require proper response from the segments and/or campuses. It should be charged with the campuses to consider all phases of planning, including the processes reserved to the professionals on page 28 of the study plan. It should be constituted to serve people and agencies of the State of California.

If such an agency were to be created, then realistic planning would be available in times of great political and fiscal uncertainties. Then we could avoid competitive practices which lead to irreversible decisions manifested in land holdings, steel and concrete buildings, and tenured faculty, none of which are very flexible or easy to change. Good planning is the only way to survive political and fiscal uncertainty with any kind of long-range continuity and purpose.

Third - refer to study plan p. 27 IA and VI - No, I do not believe the current master plan can accomodate the future needs of post-secondary education in California.

Already there are demands for planning and coordination which tax the limits of the present master plan. For example, the rapidly expanding field of extended educational opportunities in the larger metropolitan areas requires coordination which no presently established agency is able to provide.

The current master plan was developed to meet the needs of the 1960's. The 1970's are generally regarded as being a different age, and therefore the 1970's require a different plan for education. We have had planning which has been facilities oriented and thinks of cost benefit analysis in terms of space. Now we need planning which does cost benefit analysis in terms of human relationships. This is the time to establish the mechanism for continuous review of long-range plans. This is the time to establish a living, flexible, dynamic process for education in California suitable to the living, flexible dynamic California society. Two years ago Robert Hutchins wrote,

> Everything that is wrong with the American university has been wrong with it for at least fifty years. The difference is that until recently almost nobody cared...This is what higher education in America needs, serious discussion about what it is for and how to organize it to achieve its objectives...The university, instead of reflecting misguided purposes and abandoned ideals, might fashion the mind of the new age. 10

10 - Robert M. Hutchins, "The University vs Radical Activism, "CTA Journal, 3/70

5

ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION

"Conquering the right to speak its word, the right to be itself, to assume direction of its own destiny, only the Third World itself will create the currently non-existant conditions for those who today silence it to enter into dialogue with it."

Paulo Freire

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this testimony is to discuss several of the major assumptions of the Study Plan's questions about the meaning of alternative education. Secondly, this paper is concerned with suggesting descriptions of alternative education which can develop human potential and institutional organization based upon the capacity of people to participate in the development of goals which are needed for a more human existence. We are faced with problems that dehumanize and polarize us. We can create in our educational instututions an environment and relationships which can overcome these problems.

The questions raised about "Alternative Forms of Higher Education" and "Alternatives to Higher Education" in the Committee's Study Plan focus upon new forms and types of higher education and possible relationships between higher education and post-secondary education. Suggested new forms are put within the lexic on of applied systems analysis (delivery systems).

The campus is seen as one sort of "delivery system" which in a decentralized form night provide a more adequate system of community services and continuing education. Questions are then raised about evaluating and regulating the work of such applied systems.

There seem to be two basic assumptions raised in this line of questions which direct the context for the meaning of "alternative education" in very specific ways. The language of applied systems would tend to focus attention upon the technological implications of educational systems. Thus technique becomes a basic focal point for the discussion. Also implied is that alternative education (as new forms of applied and extended technologies) is somehow to be seen as neutral and not conditioned by the cultural, political and economic realities of our time. Questions are not raised directly about these aspects of our current situation in higher education as it seeks "alternatives".

We would suggest that education is a humanizing process involving self determination and group participation in the development of solutions to the crises of our social and personal worlds. The social relations involved in this educational process are the basis for finding alternatives in education. These social relations are the base for governing and directing the goals of educational technologies. Further, alternative education cannot be reduced to neutral technologies devoid of the social relations which are basic to prescribing the benefits of higher education.

Alternative education includes within its meaning the social and cultural dynamics of our relationships with each other. The current crises in these relationships find articulate expression in higher education which for some years have attempted to face human need in the areas of:

a) institutional racism and other forms of discrimination.
b) economic and social research which can overcome our societies tendencies toward warfare and inadequate employment.
c) civil and constitutional rights
d) ecological disorder
e) unequal distribution of resources for public life (taxes)
f) human potential and educational growth

Testimony presented to the joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education in California by John C. Moyer on behalf of the United Ministries Committee on Higher Education and Public Policy. March 22, 1972.

Alternative education has much to do with solving the above problems as they relate to our political economy. We life in a post technological society with its increasing hegemony in the world This fact has been ably stated by people in higher education who identify with what has come to be known as the Third World. People within our communities have also come to be called members of the Third World since many of the basic problems faced by two thirds of the world's population are also faced by many within our own society. Many of the benefits of higher education in its alternative forms have been created by peoples of the Third World.

Alternative education is about measuring the benefits of higher education in terms of its capacity to create an alternative political economy supportive of alternative social institutions. Such institutions would be based upon solving problems of social justice in California.

In the past the primary benefit of state supported higher education has gone to a minority of the state's people. However, it does not seem to be enough to merely call for a wider distribution of state resources for higher education. The impact of much of the research and teaching in state schools in California has important international impact. Thus alternative education needs to measure the benefits of higher education in terms of state, national, and international impact of state allocated resources.

ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION AND CULTURE

The cultural formation of alternative forms of education is dynamic and transforming itself quite rapidly. Attempts to describe the emerging alternative forms growing out of our cultural context are hard put to deep up with the forms which are emerging. However, during the last three years or more several basic forms have emerged and taken root in alternative cultures.

These alternatives tend to break down into three cultural groupings: 1

a. human potential, communal, collective inquiry/action
b. technological and corporate efficiency models
c. social, political, economic strategies and alternatives

Human Potential

Within the first group we find free schools and universities which are receptive to the need for self evaluation, and the basic values which have grown in relation to "counter-cultures". These values put great emphasis upon youth as a distinguishable phenomenon, anti-systems appreach to human relationships, and strong advocacy for changing the dominating cultures. Much of this has been discussed in response to the meanings of "Consciousness III".

Also within this grouping have emerged persons involved in continuing education related to changing personal identities related to sexual roles and social institutional roles (marriage, jobs, etc.) Group process, concern for affective learning, and focus upon human potential are each involved in the dynamics forming this second understanding of alternative learning. Much religious, social, and ethnic education is concerned with these changes in roles.

Technological and Corporate Efficiency Models

In the second grouping we tend to see the emergence of extended degree programs and a new concern for the implications of alternative uses of educational technologies. Extension is seen in terms of better working relations with government and industry through extended and continuing education.

The wide variety of Research and Development centers focusing upon various aspects of change in higher education would form another alternative of the second grouping. Clearing houses and the attempts to create more efficiency within current systems of higher education are attempted.

Centers for the study of alternative futures work within the current corporate efficiency context, but seek alternatives through alternative systems.

Social, Political and economic strategies

Third World Institutes and Centers have emerged during the last decade as have documentation centers and ethnic power institutes concerned that the objectified Third World become part of one's educational experience.

In the last three or four years the development of alternative economic styles which are not based upon profit or private ownership have arisen out of the ashes of the protest movements. Unionization of students and public interest groups able to provide counter institutions to the major goods and service corporations have formed.

The three groupings mentioned above have emerged as cultural forms of alternative education. They have arisen out of crisis and many of them have arisen out of the alienation and oppression perceived and experienced in colleges and universities during the last decade. The technological and corporate efficiency models have at times been effected by the unrest in higher education, but have felt in very direct ways the fiscal crisis of recent years. "Alternative" within this grouping tends to mean alternatives which can be used to maintain the basic directions of present institutions. Change clearly does not mean the same thing within these various groupings. Nor does "alternative education" mean the same thing or refer to the same events as central or major points of reference. Our point of reference involved questions concerning social relations. We will look at the political and economic aspects of alternative education from this perspective.

The above list of trends of alternative models of education and the above groupings are interrelated. To some extent these groupings are presently being funded either directly or indirectly by tax monies. However, the rate of support does not allow for any great impact upon the population nor does the present rate of support of these various alternatives change the current assumptions about the benefits of education.

ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION AND THE POLITICS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

There is a hypothesis that whichever alternatives are stated to be important in the current institutions of state supported higher education there are political considerations both within the schools and within the state which do not allow these alternatives to develop. By politics we mean the institutional congruence and opposition which tend to be manifested in institutions with different vested interests.

Many reports have attempted to show that higher education is preferential to certain groups of people within the state. Attempts are also made to show that certain groups are consistently without the means to provide themselves with the degree of higher education necessary to change their economic and social conditions. Some reports have gone so far as to suggest that the tax structure in California operates in such a way that the lower class and minority groups are paying for educational benefits that they do not receive and that they are paying for others to receive such benefits who do not support their needs.

Some reports have suggested that indirectly 2 some of these conditions have emerged out of the current master plan structure. Undoubtedly, more research is needed to see if the above reports are true. However, we would raise the question about how resources can be found to carry on such research to find it higher education is in fact providing the benefits needed by many people who are paying for our current institutions. Could alternative higher education develop such studies and find ways to alleviate any injustices which might exist in the current structure?

Can current concerns for community services and continuing education be related to the needs mentioned above? Current suggestions for such programs tend to focus upon governmental and industrial sections of the economy. Can markets be found and supported which would focus upon other sectors of the economy which may need higher education more than do current governmental and industrial personnel? We would suggest that alternative education could be funded to provide for sectors in greatest need of continuing education.

ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION AND THE FINANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

In 1969-70 approximately $1.5 billion dollars was spent for higher education in the State of California. About 50% of this amount ($760.2 million) was from state funds. 3 To measure the cost of that resource to the people in terms of human and technological development has been a continuing problem for legislators and educators. Attempts have been made to measure:

the cost per student
the cost per sector of higher education
the cost by program (primary and support)
the cost in terms of indirect subsidies to industry and
other state agencies and departments besides education

These major cost-benefit programs tend to limit themselves to the needs of the current institutions and participants in state supported higher education. Built into these programs is an analysis that the current institutions can best provide the alternatives needed if they have the cost-benefit program they need. Thus the resources available for higher education are rationalized into cost-benefit programs which tend to maintain the status quo of the current institutions. Interrelationships between the University, State Colleges (universities) and the community colleges can be readjusted through alternative cost benefit programs. However, such reajustments do not necessarily raise the question of who needs the benefits of higher education outside of the populations and institutions currently included in the present cost-benefit programs.

To measure more adequately the output (social and economic indicators) of higher education we would suggest that it is also necessary to understand who is not benefitting from current institutions and who is worse off because of current cost-benefit programs.

Some present forms of alternative education and alternatives to higher education are attempting to face these problems. However, the state controls the major resources and presently spends very little on the majority of people suffering under the exclusion from present state supported institutions of higher education.

The current funding of community colleges is a case in point. Current alternative funding proposals for full state funding or 50/50 funding suggest that more central review and control by the state would be necessary. We would question this assumption. Alternative forms of education seem to function most adequately in highly decentralized contexts. Cost-benefit programs are needed which can support this direction and which can include alternative forms of education which affirm self-determination and community directed and related efforts.

ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION AND SOCIAL RELATIONS

The attempt has been made to suggest a context for the meaning of alternative education which would include basic cultural, political, and economic considerations. Within this context several dynamics and directions are apparent which could provide a cost-benefit analysis and historical perspective needed for a significant new legislative judgement to be considered. 4

Of the various forms of alternative education which we saw in the section on cultural developments the area which provides the basic changes we need is related to alternative social strategies and policy studies for higher education. Reference has been made to Third World attempts to provide such strategies. We know how difficult it has been for resources to be provided in this area. We have seen the difficulties involved in maintaining Educational Opportunities Programs and Third World Colleges. Would it not be feasible for a new master plan to provide resources so that Third World Colleges can become a more significant part of higher education? Perhaps the alternatives offered by cuch sectors of higher education could be developed if they were taken more seriously as a basic component of the structure of higher education.

With major resources going into institutions concerned with alternative forms of social and personal education, basic problems could be faced more adequately. Resources could be allocated for Third World Insititutions of higher education which would be planned and directed by those who do not presently benefit from higher education and need forms of higher education which will meet their needs. What if twenty percent of the resources available for higher education went into alternative forms of education able to face and solve some of our most basic problems? Some of our basic structures could be analyzed, such as: 5

Socio-Economic Structures
- Banking Structures
- Business Enterprise structures
- Real-estate structures
- Agrarian structures

Political-Cultural structures
- Political-Partisan structure
- Union-cooperative structure
- University structure
- Structure of the means of social communication

These structures could be analyzed in the context of how they effect the Third World people. The goal of such policy studies and research would be social justice. 5 Our committee would urge you to consider such alternative forms of higher education.

Your concern and interest in this testimony is much appreciated. On behalf of the Campus Ministry Committee I wish to thank you.

NOTES

1. Walsh, J., "Alternative Futures: Where the Student Protests Were Heading," The Church Review, Vol. XXX, No. 5 Cambridge, Mass. Jan. 1972

2. Shapiro and Barlow, "San Francisco State-Business as Usual," "Leviathan" Vol. 1, No. 2, April 1969
   Miller, UMHE Studies of EOP Program in Calif., 1971, San Francisco

3. "Analysis of the Budget Bill of the State of Calif.," Report of the Legislative Analyst to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, 1971-72

4. Jerome, J., Culture out of Anarchy: The Reconstruction of American Higher Learning,

5. Camera, Letter to Friends, October, 1971

Also cf.
Freire, Paulo, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, (Herder and Herder, N.Y.) 1970
"Cultural Action for Freedom" (Harvard Educational Review, Mass) 1970

6

ACTION PROPOSALS

This report can be used by individuals who would like some direction in developing a personal ministry related to higher education. It can be used by pastors and other church persons who would like to develop cadres within a congregation or among congregations interested in ministries related to higher education. It can be used in the process of developing positions by judicatories on matters related to higher education. And it can be used as a model for developing ministries related to any public policy area.

Within a congregation the following specific suggestions for use of this material may be helpful. It can be used as:

a) a study guide for committees on Christian Social Relations
b) a training manual for parish members preparing to engage in ministry with higher education through parish or denominational structures
c) a resource handbook for a sermon series with discussion groups under the heading of Church and Society
d) a study section for Senior High Youth Groups as part of their introduction and orientation to the world of higher education
e) resource materials for all parish delegates to annual denominational meetings responsible for policy decisions and funding for ministry with higher education
f) a discussion guide for presentations on Student Sunday or collegian gatherings during Christmas and other vacations

Each person and group will want to develop its own method of engagement with the issues, however the following ideas are offered for whatever help they may be. The following listing is not intended to suggest a sequence of events, nor to suggest that one activity is any more appropriate than another.

a) establish relationships with one or more higher education institutions in your own neighborhood - become acquainted with faculty, students, and administrators there so you know them personally and have identification with their concerns - identify and become acquainted with these same persons who may be members of your own congregation
b) become acquainted with your assemblyman and state senator and staff - find out what his views on educational issues are - share with him your views - arrange to be in touch with his office regularly as your involvement and the course of events refine the situation in the state
c) develop contacts with denominational, UMHE, and COHEPP personnel so that a more effective statewide network can be established through the churches on matters relating to higher education
d) choose a particular issue (like the problem of financing a college education when one has no financial resources) and follow it through from the points of view of the several persons concerned (like the poor student, the administrator trying to balance the budget, the legislator concerned about open access, and the citizen who wants a more vital society.)
e) find out who in your group has special skills or contacts (one may be a retired superintendent or principal) and follow through his or her leads
f) work for the election of public officers whose educational position will improve the higher education situation in the state - in the meanwhile, give moral support to those who are struggling for improvement and progress.
g) give support to joint committee recommendations which will be submitted to the legislature in the winter of 1972-1973. Be prepared to contribute to the public discussion of the issues and to securing the necessary assembly and senate votes.

7

RESOURCE BANK

California Legislature, Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, Assembly P.O. Box 83, State Capitol, Sacramento, 95814, phone 916-445-4820, Assembly Members: John Vasconcellos (Chm.), Willie Brown, Jerry Lewis, Ken Meade, and John Stull
Senate Members: Howard Way (V. Chm.), Alfred Alquist, Dennis Carpenter, Mervyn Dymally, and Albert Rodda
Committee Consultant is Patrick Callan

Committee on Higher Education and Public Policy (note address below) John Moyer, Bill Schatz, Bill Van Ness, Al Cohen (Chm.), Bruce Bueschel, Lefty Schultz, Bob Mayo, Paul Kittlaus, Al Axelton, John Moore

Campus Minstry Staff - United Ministries in Higher Education and others with whom UMHE works closely on related projects

California Community Colleges
Mary Alice Geier, 5250 Santa Monica Blvd., L.A. 90029, 213-665-5771
Bob Mayo, 330 Ellis No. 406, S.F., 94102, 415-441-8092

California State University and Colleges
CHICO: Mary Immel, First at Broadway, Chico, 95926
FRESNO: El Hoffman, 2311 E. Shaw, Fresno, 93726, 209-222-3796
FULLERTON: Ralph Kennedy, 2500 E. Nutwood, No. 22M, Fullerton, 92631, 714-525-2438
HUMBOLDT: George Walker, Drawer M, Big Lagoon Park, Trinidad, 95570, 707-677-3343
LONG BEACH: Jim Johnson, 5550 Atherton, L.B., 90815, 213-596-6913
LOS ANGELES: Al Cohen, 2208 Tuller Rd., L.A., 90032, 213-221-9141
Bill Schatz, Rm. C-1030 King Hall, 5151 State College Dr., L.A. 90032, 213-224-2658
NORTHRIDGE: Al Axelton, 18302 Plummer, Northridge, 91324, 213-886-6661
POMONA: Dave Barnes, 525 Carlton Pl., Claremont, 91711, 714-624-8849
SACRAMENTO: Jim Burnett, 5900 Newman Court, Scaramento, 95819, 916-457-9855
SAN DIEGO: Dave Burnight, 5717 Lindo Paseo, San Diego, 92115, 714-583-3088
SAN FRANCISCO: Lefty Schultz, 190 Denslowe Dr., S.F., 94132, 415-333-4920
SAN JOSE: Peter Koopman, 300 S. 10th, San Jose, 95112, 415-298-0204
SAN LUIS OBISPO: Bruce Tjaden, 1468 Foothill Bl., S.L.O. 93401, 805-544-3710

University of California
BERKELEY: John Moyer, 2700 Bancroft, Berkeley, 94704, 415-845-2727
Evi Christenson/Sig Lokken, 2311 Bowditch, Berkeley, 94704
DAVIS: John Moore/John Pamperin, 433 Russell B. Davis, 95616, 916-753-2000
IRVINE: Ed Allen, 4201 Campus Dr., Irvine, 92650, 714-833-0891
LOS ANGELES: Charles Doak, 900 Hilgard Av., L.A., 90024, 213-475-5979
Virginia Buus, 900 Hilgard Av., L.A. 90024, 213-475-5926
RIVERSIDE: Darell Weist, 3701 Canyon Crest Dr., Riverside, 92507, 714-686-5320
SAN DIEGO: Les Atkinson, 8854 Cliffridge Dr., La Jolla, 92037, 714-453-2000
SANTA BARBARA: Bill VanNess, 777 Camino Pescadero, S.B., 93017, 805-968-1555
SANTA CRUZ: Darrell Yeaney, 900 High St. Santa Cruz, 95060, 408-426-2010

Private Colleges in California

OCCIDENTAL: Bruce Bueschel, 1600 Campus Rd., L.A. 90041, 213-255-5151
STANFORD: David & Penny Mann, Box 5067, Stanford, 94305
UNIV. OF PACIFIC: Dan Bava, Anderson "Y", U of P, Stockton, 95204, 209-466-1496
UNIV. OF SO. CAL.: Cecil Hoffman, Jr., 835 W. 34th St., L.A. 90007, 213-746-6116

Area Offices

NO. CAL: Liz Cathcart, 330 Ellis No. 406, San Francisco, 94102, 415-441-P092
SO. CAL: Paul Kearns, 835 W. 34th St., L.A., 90007, 213-746-6117
UMHE COM.: Paul Kittlaus, 817 W. 34th St., L.A., 90007, 213-747-7255

There are many books, magazines, newspapers, and reports dealing with every aspect of higher education. Rather than attempting to provide a bibliography, we urge you to discuss the availability of written material with your local campus minister to more specifically choose those resources which will most nearly fit your needs. We would like to invite your attention to three resources which have been developed here in California with California higher education in mind.

The "Challenge of Higher Education" is a multi-media presentation featuring three screens and projectors and a taped collage of sounds, music, and interviews. The show swirls the viewer about in a whirlpool of change and conflict and suggests that higher education is a primary focal point for new ways of responding to the changing needs of our society. The presentation focuses upon the purpose and direction of higher education in California and seeks to stimulate a wider cross-section of the populace to dialogue an actual involvement in shaping the educational process. Made in 1971.

If you are interested in using the "Challenge of Higher Education" in your community, please contact Lefty Schultz, Ecumenical House, 190 Denslowe Drive, San Francisco, Ca., 94132, 415-333-4920

Simulation games are a new and effective way to involve a group of persons in situations so that they have fresh insight and understanding of complex issues. Participation in decision making and coalition building gives one realistic experience and a clearer perspective on what is happening. Last Winter and Spring three games on the Policy Negotiation Model were constructed to give players contact with each of the three segments of public higher education in the state. A three hour period of time is ample to play one of the games. There is a Community College Game, a University of California Game and a State University and College Game.

If you are interested in using one of these simulation games, please contact Virginia Buus, 900 Hilgard, Los Angeles, 90024, 213-475-5926.

Efforts to facilitate direct contact between congregations and neighboring community colleges have been helpful to both churches and colleges. There has been prepared a handbook for churchmen concerned about community colleges called, "There's a Community College in My Town - What Do I Do Now?" What to do and how to do it are thrusts of the pamphlet prepared by Mary Alice Geir and published in February 1972. It is available from her office at 5250 Santa Monica Blvd., Los Angeles, CA., 90029, or from Bob Mayo's office at 330 Ellis No. 406, San Francisco, 94102.

CALIFORNIA STATE LEGISLATORS — 1970 - 1972

SENATE

DISTRICT	NAME & PARTY	DISTRICT OFFICE ADDRESS	TELEPHONE
13	Alquist, Alfred E. (D)	777 N. 1st St., Rm. 245, San Jose 95112	408 286-8318
4	Behr, Peter H. (R)	1299 4th St., Rm. 301, San Rafael 94901	415 457-9441
26	Beilenson, Anthony C. (D)	1122 S. Robertson Blvd., S. 14, Los Angeles 90035	213 278-2234
14	Bradley, Clark L. (R)	599 First National Bank Bldg., San Jose 95113	408 293-4861
38	Burgener, Clair W. (R)	8690 Center Dr., Suite 3, La Mesa 92041	714 460-7041
34	Carpenter, Dennis E. (R)	P.O. Box CC, Irvine 92664	714 557-3200
22	Carrell, Tom (D)	753 San Fernando Rd., San Fernando 91340	213 361-1141
1	Collier, Randolph (D)	State Capitol, Rm. 3086, Sacramento 95814	916 445-4641
36	Cologne, Gorden (R)	P.O. Drawer 1270, Indio 92201	714 347-5530
20	Coombs, William E. (R)	P.O. Box 146, Rialto 92376	714 875-7676
21	Cusanovich, Lou (R)	14921 Ventura Blvd., St. 304, Sherman Oaks 91403	213 788-2300
37	Deukmejian, George (R)	555 East Ocean Blvd., Long Beach 90802	213 435-4865
32	Dills, Ralph C. (D)	529 W. 8th St., San Pedro 90731	213 831-6377
29	Dymally, Mervyn M. (D)	2622 S. Western Ave., Los Angeles 90018	213 620-5600
12	Gregorio, Arlen F. (D)	161 W. 25th Ave., San Mateo 94403	415 574-1970
17	Grunsky, Donald L. (R)	P.O. Box 1186, Watsonville 95076	408 722-3511
21	Harmer, John L. (R)	401 N. Brand Blvd., Suite 726, Glendale 91203	213 246-8228
8	Holmdahl, John W. (D)	1111 Jackson St., Oakland 94607	415 464-0863
33	Kennick, Joseph M. (D)	110 Pine Ave., Suite 606, Long Beach 90802	213 432-5471
24	Lagomarsino, Robert J. (R)	21 So. California, Ventura 93001	805 648-5911
9	Marks, Milton (R)	350 McAllister St., San Francisco 94102	415 557-1437
2	Marler, Fred W., Jr. (R)	P.O. Box 2297, Redding 96001	916 241-8280
40	Mills, James R. (D)	U.S. Grant Hotel, Suite 345, San Diego 92101	714 234-2131
10	Moscone, George R. (D)	540 Van Ness Ave., San Francisco 94102	415 391-1670
7	Nejedly, John A. (R)	1393 Civic Drive, Walnut Creek 94596	415 934-4558
11	Petris, Nicholas C. (D)	1111 Jackson St., Oakland 94607	415 464-1333
19	Richardson, H. L. (R)	735 W. Duarte Rd., Suite 304, Arcadia 91006	213 620-2823
5	Rodda, Albert S. (D)	State Capitol, Rm. 4048, Sacramento 95814	916 445-5788
39	Schrade, Jack (R)	1904 Hotel Circle, San Diego 92110	714 291-2225
6	Short, Alan (D)	State Capitol, Rm. 4076, Sacramento 95814	916 445-5215
28	Song, Alfred H. (D)	2337 S. Garfield Ave., Monterey Park 91754	213 724-3825
25	Stevens, Robert S. (R)	1245 Glendon Ave., Suite 35, Los Angeles 90024	213 473-2147
18	Stiern, Walter W. (D)	930 Truxton Ave., Rm. 201, Bakersfield 93301	805 323-3379
3	Teale, Stephen P. (D)	State Capitol, Rm. 5082, Sacramento 95814	916 445-6447
30	Walsh, Lawrence E. (D)	6055 E. Washington Blvd., Commerce 90022	213 778-0604
15	Way, Howard (R)	State Capitol, Rm. 4042, Sacramento 95814	916 445-6447
31	Wedworth, James Q. (D)	8404 S. Crenshaw Blvd., Inglewood 90305	213 778-0604
35	Whetmore, James E. (R)	13163 Brookhurst, Garden Grove 92640	714 534-8000
16	Zenovich, George N. (D)	1060 Fulton Mall, Suite 1310, Fresno 93721	209 488-5567
27	Vacancy		

ASSEMBLY

DISTRICT	NAME & PARTY	DISTRICT OFFICE ADDRESS	TELEPHONE
26	Arnett, Dixon (R)	695 Veterans Blvd., Suite B, Redwood City 94063	415 364-0260
71	Badham, Robert E. (R)	1649 Westcliff, Suite C, Newport Beach 92660	714 548-3913
7	Bagley, William T. (R)	225 Albert Bldg., San Rafael 94901	415 456-2421
78	Barnes, E. Richard (R)	3320 Kemper, Suite 101, San Diego 92110	714 222-1178
13	Bee, Carlos (D)	22734 Main St., Hayward 94541	415 538-5533
2	Belotti, Frank P. (R)	P.O. Box 1025, Eureka 95501	707 442-9272
46	Beverly, Robert G. (R)	1611 S. Pacific Coast Hwy., Redondo Beach 90277	213 378-8522
74	Biddle, W. Craig (R)	6370 Magnolia Ave., Suite 211, Riverside 92506	714 682-2052
63	Brathwaite, Yvonne W. (D)	4036 Buckingham Rd., Los Angeles 90008	213 295-5424
35	Briggs, John V. (R)	3711 N. Harbor Blvd., Fullerton 92632	714 879-2345
18	Brown, Willie L., Jr. (D)	666 Octavia St., San Francisco 94102	415 557-3616
70	Burke, Robert H. (R)	17732 Beach Blvd., Huntington Beach 92647	714 842-1494
20	Burton, John L. (D)	350 McAllister St., San Francisco 94102	415 557-3616
50	Campbell, William "Bill" (R)	101 S. Second St., La Puente 91744	213 330-4505
79	Chacon, Peter R. (D)	5106 Federal Bldg., Suite 107, San Diego 92105	714 263-2148
6	Chappie, Eugene A. (R)	3123 State Capitol, Sacramento 95814	916 445-7298
64	Cline, Robert C. (R)	6355 Topanga Blvd. St 418, Woodland Hills 91364	213 347-2222
54	Collier, John L. E. (R)	1109 Fair Oaks Ave., So. Pasadena 91030	213 799-9462
57	Conrad, Charles J. (R)	13440 Ventura Blvd., Sherman Oaks 91403	213 872-0057
69	Cory, Kenneth (D)	P.O. Box 3067, Anaheim 92801	714 635-4722
14	Crown, Robert W. (D)	1111 Jackson St., Oakland 94607	415 464-0847
44	Cullen, Mike (D)	444 W. Ocean Blvd., Long Beach 90802	213 830-6444
1	Davis, Pauline (Mrs.) (D)	P.O. Box 1071, Portola 96122	916 832-5013
77	Deddeh, Wadie P. (D)	240 Woodlawn Ave., Chula Vista 92010	714 427-7077
10	Dent, James W. (R)	2700 Concord Ave., Concord 94520	415 689-1973
21	Duffy, Gordon W. (R)	321 North Douty, Hanford 93230	209 582-4431
5	Dunlap, John F. (D)	1221 Monterey St., Vallejo 94590	707 596-2258
51	Fenton, Jack R. (R)	1601 W. Beverly Blvd., Montebello 90640	213 724-3400
15	Fong, March K. (Mrs.) (D)	10 Eastmont Mall, Oakland 94605	415 562-1515
23	Foran, John Francis (D)	350 McAllister St., San Francisco 94102	415 557-2253
40	Garcia, Alex P. (D)	257 So. Spring St., Los Angeles 90012	213 628-5155
66	Gonsalves, Joe A. (D)	12340 E. Firestone Blvd., Norwalk 90650	213 868-7710
53	Greene, Bill (D)	203 E. Vernon Ave., Los Angeles 90037	213 234-9021
3	Greene, Leroy F. (D)	3400 Cottage Way, Sacramento 95825	916 483-2738
22	Hayden, Richard D. (R)	955 Helena Dr., Sunnyvale 94087	408 739-0983
39	Hayes, James A. (R)	666 E. Ocean Blvd., Long Beach 90802	213 435-8911
58	Johnson, Harvey (D)	11001 E. Valley Blvd., El Monte 91731	213 443-0061
4	Johnson, Ray E. (R)	352 Vallombrosa St., Chico 95926	916 343-8686
45	Karabian, Walter J. (D)	231 W. Garvey, Monterey Park 91754	213 288-3844
29	Ketchum, William M. (R)	1601 H St., Bakersfield 93302	805 323-3146
41	Keysor, Jim (D)	16852 Knollwood Dr., Granada Hills 91344	213 361-1234
11	Knox, John T. (D)	3803 MacDonald Ave., Richmond 94805	415 237-8171
30	Lacoste, Ernest (D)	911 - 13th St., Modesto 95354	209 526-3032
47	Lanterman, Frank (R)	106 A South Los Robles, Pasadena 91101	213 449-4747
73	Lewis, Jerry (R)	3972 N. Waterman, San Bernardino 92404	714 886-5201
37	MacDonald, Ken (D)	P.O. Box 1681, Ventura 93001	805 648-5329
36	MacGillivray, W. Don (R)	Studio 117 El Paseo, Santa Barbara 93101	805 963-1786
32	Maddy, Kenneth L. (R)	1221 Van Ness, Suite 620, Fresno 93721	209 486-0910
25	McAlister, Alister (D)	1577B E. Santa Clara, San Jose 95116	408 272-0221
19	McCarthy, Lee T. (D)	350 McAllister St., San Francisco 94102	415 557-2462
16	Meade, Ken (D)	3333 Grand Ave., Oakland 94610	415 464-0786
17	Miller, John J. (D)	6565 Shattuck Ave., Oakland 94609	415 654-1811
33	Mobley, Ernest H. (R)	600 West Shaw, Fresno 93704	209 224-5293
12	Monagan, Bob (R)	406 Bank of America Bldg., Stockton 95202	209 466-3351
43	Moorhead, Carlos J. (R)	420 N. Brand Blvd., Glendale 91203	213 247-8445
42	Moretti, Bob (D)	12444 Victory Blvd., N. Hollywood 91606	213 895-0910
31	Murphy, Frank, Jr. (R)	1810 L St., Merced 95340	209 722-8871
65	Pierson, David C. (D)	300 E. Queen, Inglewood 90301	213 673-5503
38	Porter, Carley V. (D)	1717 N. Long Beach Blvd., Compton 90221	213 774-1937
8	Powers, Walter W. (D)	P.O. Box 15265, Sacramento 95813	916 925-0633
60	Priolo, Paul (R)	12121 Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles 90025	213 820-1525
72	Quimby, John P. (D)	227 A South Riverside, Rialto 92376	714 875-7272
55	Ralph, Leon (D)	1922 East 103rd St., Los Angeles 90002	213 564-1848
48	Roberti, David A. (D)	2904 Rowena Ave., Los Angeles 90039	213 666-5171
62	Russell, Newton R. (R)	3507 West Magnolia Blvd., Burbank 91505	213 848-0643
27	Ryan, Leo J. (D)	308 Linden Ave., South San Francisco 94080	415 871-6300
49	Schabarum, Peter F. (R)	573 So. Barranca, Covina 91722	213 332-6271
75	Seeley, Raymond T. (Ray) (R)	300 S. Imperial, Suite 5, El Centro 92243	714 352-8150
59	Sieroty, Alan (D)	1144 South Robertson, Los Angeles 90035	213 278-2592
28	Stacey, Kent H. (R)	P.O. Box 2232, Bakersfield 93303	805 327-3828
80	Stull, John (R)	714 Second St., Encinitas 92024	714 753-6561
68	Thomas, Vincent (D)	255 W. 5th St., San Pedro 90731	213 833-2881
67	Townsend, L. E. (Larry) (D)	15225 S. Western Ave., Gardena 90249	213 327-5920
24	Vasconcellos, John (D)	100 W. Rincon Ave., Campbell 95008	408 379-8000
52	Wakefield, Floyd L. (R)	7340 E. Florence Ave., Downey 90240	213 927-2586
56	Warren, Charles (D)	1411 W. Olympic Blvd., Los Angeles 90015	213 386-8042
61	Waxman, Henry A. (D)	5208 W. Pico Blvd., Los Angeles 90019	213 935-1262
76	Wilson, Pete (R)	233 "A" St. San Diego 92101	714 233-7376
34	Wood, Robert G. (R)	32 E. Alisal, Salinas 93901	408 422-9085
9	Z'berg, Edwin L. (D)	1501 W. Capitol Ave., West Sacramento 95691	916 371-8652

Sacramento Address for Legislators: **State Capitol, Sacramento, California 95814** **Phone: 916 445-4711**

Appendix I

CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS:

THE CHURCH
HIGHER EDUCATION
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

1851 First private college, California Weslyan (University of the Pacific)

1855 College of California chartered jointly by the Congregational Association of California and the Presbytery of San Francisco

1862 First state college, California State Normal School at San Francisco (moved to less-wordly San Jose in 1870)

1867 160 acre campus of the College of California, Berkeley, donated by the churches to the state as a state university - founding of the University of California system

1899, 1919, 1931, 1947, and 1953 Commissions and studies re higher education in California; creation of the Liason Committee

1920 Denominationally funded campus ministry established at the University of California, Berkeley

1959 legislative session. Need for higher education coordination; (23 bills, 3 resolutions, and 2 constitutional amendments re new institutions, functional, or structural changes) ACR 88: that a Master Plan for Higher Education in California be prepared by a representative Master Plan Survey Team

1959 to 1969 The decade of higher education expansion & turmoil

1959:63 public junior colleges	1969:85 public junior colleges
14 Calif. State Colleges	19 Calif. State Colleges
5 Univ. of Cal. campuses	9 Univ. of Cal. campuses
69 private accred. instit.	79 private accred. inst.
459,455 students	990,418 students

1960 Donahoe Act; implementation of Master Plan, 1960-1975; creation of Coordinating Council for Higher Education

1961 Creation of the Trustees of the California State Colleges (centralized administration succeeded independent campuses)

1964 Free Speech Movement at UC Berkeley, Mario Savio

Oct. 1966 No. Calif. UMHE Commission distributed 25,000 copies of "Politics and the University", statewide

Nov. 1966 Ronald Reagan elected governor, ex-officio on boards; appointive power in selecting Regents and Trustees

Jan. 1967	So. Calif. UMHE Commission Statement adopted calling for public discussion of higher education issues
1968	creation of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (supplanted control by the State Board of Education)
Fall 1968	strike at San Francisco State; police actions
Winter 1969	strike at UC Berkeley; People's Park actions; police actions
Sept. 1970	Legislative Resolution calling for a Joint Committee to review the Master Plan and for "the development of a new Master Plan for Higher Education in California"
Mar. 1971	COHEPP formed "to coordinate activities of No. and So. Calif. campus ministry staffs for max. effectiveness"
Mar. 1971	Joint Committee on Master Plan appointed by legislature
Jul. 1971	Legislative Resolution further detailing exploration of the Master Plan by the Joint Committee and the Select Committee of the Coordinating Council
Winter 1972	public hearings on the Master Plan according to a Study Plan adopted in January
Jan. 1973	target date for presentation to the legislature by the Joint Committee of recommendations for a new Master Plan for Higher Education in California

Appendix II

ASSEMBLY MEMBERS
JOHN VASCONCELLOS
Chairman
WILLIE BROWN
JERRY LEWIS
KEN MEADE
JOHN STULL

SENATE MEMBERS
HOWARD WAY
Vice Chairman
ALFRED ALQUIST
DENNIS CARPENTER
MERVYN DYMALLY
ALBERT RODDA

California Legislature

Joint Committee on The Master Plan for Higher Education

MAILING ADDRESS
ASSEMBLY P. O. Box 83
STATE CAPITOL
SACRAMENTO 95814
TELEPHONE 916 — 445 4820

COMMITTEE CONSULTANT
PATRICK M. CALLAN

ASSISTANT CONSULTANTS
DAN FRIEDLANDER
SUE POWELL

STAFF ASSISTANT
WILL SHADISH

COMMITTEE SECRETARIES
LINDA ROBERTS
JACLYN JONES

June 14, 1972

Rev. Al Cohen
2208 Tuller Road
Los Angeles, California 90032

Dear Al:

I want to thank you and the members of the Committee on Higher Education and Public Policy of the California Campus Ministry for your participation in the work of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education. It is most gratifying to me as a legislator to have the cooperation and assistance and perspective of members of the clergy as we work together to develop public policy for higher education in the state of California.

I am particularly appreciative of the very thoughtful and perceptive statements developed by the Committee on Higher Education and Public Policy and presented to the Joint Committee as testimony in our public hearings. Your statements on Governance, Financing, Planning, and on Alternative Forms of Higher Education have been most helpful to the members of the Committee and to our staff.

I believe the Campus Ministers have a unique perspective on California higher education and I thank you for sharing it with me and the members of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education.

Best wishes,

John Vasconcellos

JV/lr